

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/511,912	02/23/2000	Tatau Nishinaga	JEL 31015	4100
7590 04/06/2004			EXAMINER	
Stevens Davis Miller & Mosher LLP			ANDERSON, MATTHEW A	
1615 L Street NW Suite 850			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Washington, D	C 20036-4387		1765	

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	· 	AS				
The same of the sa	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/511,912	NISHINAGA, TATAU				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Matthew A. Anderson	1765				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app						
THE REPLY FILED 24 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application ) a timely filed amendment whice	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in				
PERIOD FOR RI	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	ng date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAY 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (c)	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for replying later than three months after the ma	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of t	inally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	I be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		idered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
.☑ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: none.						
Claim(s) objected to: none.	Đ					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6,11-18 and 20-23</u> .		·				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
10. Other:						
•		NADINE G. NORTON				
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER						
	1/1/2	11				
		~				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: as the applicant has rightly pointed out on page 2 of the response that the only difference from claim 1 of the amendment of September 25,2003 and that of the original claim 1 was "via the opening" The examiner notes the original claim 1 was rejected on its merits. Since the applicant argues that "via the opening" would have rightly been anticpated because the original claim 1 had an opening, the examiner must argue for the propriety of the final rejection of 1/30/2004. The rejection of original claim 1 was initially made over prior art of the of record (i.e. over Tokunaga et al and Nakamura et al.) on 10/18/2001. The same art was used in the Final Rejection in question.